

Location of Meeting	600 Maryland Ave, NW – 5001
Time of Meeting	10:30 am – 12:33 pm
Purpose of Meeting	1. Archaeology Phase II presentation of findings 2. Discussion on preliminary assessment of potential effects on NR Resources in the APE
Attendees:	Sharon Park SI Amy Ballard, SI Jane Passman, SI Curtis Davis SI Susan Spain, NPS NAMA Nancy Witherell, NCPC Martha Catlin, ACHP Perry Wheelock, NPS/NAMA Sally Blumenthal, NPS Thomas Luebke, CFA John Parsons, NPS David Maloney, DC HPO Ineeter Brown, DCOP Dreck Wilson, ASLAH George H.F. Oberlander, National Coalition to Save Our Mall Ruth Troccoli, DC HPO Felicia Bell, USCHS Tom Whitley, Guild of Professional Tour Guides Patsy Fletcher, AAHGS Hany Hassan, BBB Kevin Storm, BBB Judy Robinson, Robinson & Associates Erin Brasell, Robinson & Associates Charlie LeeDecker, Berger Catherine Price, Berger Erin Kimsey, Berger

This meeting followed a 9:00am-10:30am bus tour of the NMAAHC site.

PRESENTATION

Charlie LeeDecker presented the Phase II Archaeology findings.

Following the presentation, Charlie LeeDecker clarified several issues:

- In the 1700’s, the site was occupied by a plantation.
- Debris material found on the site was a result of residents depositing fill to this low lying area, most deposits date to the 1870s. This debris material is very similar to the types of material found at other sites within the District.
- The team also found remnants of a 1930’s tennis court
- No evidence of the canal towpath was found

SUMMARY OF EFFECTS MATRIX

Sharon Park distributed the Summary of Effects Matrix. The team has used a ranking system (one to three stars) to address adverse effects. A single star represents effects that might be more easily addressed through mitigation. Three star items are not able to be mitigated but can be addressed.

Several comments and suggestions followed:

- **Sally Blumenthal** stated that the landscaping would be severely altered by a building on the site. Secondly, she noted that it was not by accident that Laurie Olin chose this site as his landscape vista, the postcard shot [the long flat view going to 17th Street]. One cannot put anything there without destroying the character. Finally, she noted that any building on the site would irreversibly change the character of the Monument. She also made several suggestions for the matrix:
 - Each of the items under land use and vegetation should be designated as three stars; these are all major effects that alter a character defining feature.
 - the new building should be a higher priority than recreational space
 - In the views and vistas section, the first bullet should be broken into two bullets; the view of the Monument and its setting should be the highest priority and the monuments setting should be further down.
- **Martha Catlin** stated that the matrix needs to address CFR 800.4. This process requires formal consultation between the SI and DC HPO and she recommended that the matrix be revised to reflect the views of the DC HPO. She made two additional recommendations: the verbs should be removed and the National Register terminology should be used.
- **John Parsons** suggested that this matrix be renamed ‘Summary of the character defining features’. He also recommended changing the word “vegetation” to “landscape” because the spatial organization of the site is different and the vegetation is not the same as the designed landscape of the site.
- **George Oberlander** stated that anything on the site would have major impacts and completely change the character of the site.
- **David Maloney** commented on the Landscape, noting that anything built here would impact the Monument landscape with the expanse of lawn and trees. He stated that views and vistas should also emphasize the Monument and its grounds by focusing on the threshold views:
 - Category A Views- 14th and Constitution, 17th and Constitution, view from Lincoln Memorial, view from WWII Memorial
 - Category B views- panoramic views from within the grounds, directional views
 - Category C views from the grounds to the immediate context on the outside,
 - Category D views- views from surrounding streets,
 - Category E views- very broad contextual views
- Multiple attendees noted that the views from flight paths, also the aerial of the Monument itself, should be considered.
- **Patsy Fletcher** asked for clarification on the “setting” that is being referenced (in terms of ranking the terminology for views and vistas and keeping in mind the National Register terms and characteristics of the national monument setting). Several responses were offered:
 - Sharon Park responded that the setting is comes closer to the edge of the Monument. The primary setting is its own reserve.
 - Sally Blumenthal responded that the setting is the Washington Monument grounds; the National Register denotes that L’Enfant had a monument to Washington there.
 - Martha Catlin noted that the setting goes beyond the National Register grounds.
 - Judy Robinson responded that the site has both a local and global setting
 - David Maloney noted that the larger context is not as significant

DISCUSSION

David Maloney stated the site is too small for this program. He noted that the program is extremely important and there is this clash between the importance of site and the importance of the museum. The NMAH produced a report from 2002 that discussed the deficiencies of their museum. It is important for the NMAAHC to have the space to tell this story, and avoid the issues that plague the NMAH.

He stated that the site needs to be expanded suggesting that the majority of the program should be on the other site of 14th Street. The NMAH and NMAAHC should be right next to each other because they are telling the same story of American History. This museum placement on the opposite side of 14th street could provide entry on two levels and solves the preservation problems on these grounds. He stated that the first priority should be the African American History.

Martha Catlin argued that the undertaking is not feasible; the architectural program that justifies the scope of the project has not been made available. She requested that the process revisit how this undertaking is being described.

Curtis Davis stated that the process should move forward. He stated that the split program alternative is not up for discussion but noted that it is important to understand the general scope of what it would take to begin the consideration of that option as a viable alternative.

Sharon Park adjourned the meeting at 12:33pm.